



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/364,370	07/30/1999	TOM THUAN CHEUNG	ST9-99-077/P70-42971	9357

27896 7590 08/15/2002

EPSTEIN, EDELL, SHAPIRO, FINNAN & LYTLE, LLC
1901 RESEARCH BOULEVARD
SUITE 400
ROCKVILLE, MD 20850

EXAMINER

HO, THE T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2151

DATE MAILED: 08/15/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application N .

09/364,370

Applicant(s)

CHEUNG, TOM THUAN

Examin r

The T. Ho

Art Unit

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 July 1999.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the application filed 07/30/1999.
2. Claims 1-30 have been examined and are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

There is no antecedent basis in claim 11 for "the server computer".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-8, 11-18 and 21-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dean U.S. Patent No. 6,003,094 in view of Smithies U.S. Patent No. 5,544,255.

As to claim 11, Dean discloses a computer (gateway workstation 14, line 36 column 2); computer programs (1-5, Fig. 2), performed by the computer, for receiving (6, Fig. 3) an input object (client-side request object, lines 1-2 column 4) contains input data (data indicative of requests of a given request type, line 48-49 column 2) and one

input function (request data, line 50 column 2), determining a type of the received input object (to ascertain what type of request it has received, lines 31-32 column 4), , executing the input function (execute the request, line 55 column 4). However, Dean does not teach determining if the input object satisfies predefined requirement.

Smithies teaches determining (to verify, line 47 column 7) if the input object (signature envelope 10, line 48 column 7) satisfies (lines 47-54 column 7) predefined requirement (a signatory database, line 51 column 7). It would have been obvious to apply the teachings of Smithies to the system of Dean because it provides security when processing a client object.

As to claim 12, Smithies further teaches ascertaining whether the received input object satisfies predefined requirements by executing (are performed, line 36 column 7) verification functions (verification functions, line 36 column 7).

As to claim 13, Smithies further teaches a source code for each verification function (verification functions, line 36 column 7) is located in a predefined section of a controller object (signature verification module 6, line 8 column 16) source code.

As to claim 14, Dean as modified further teaches computer programs (lines 60 column 3 to line 32 column 5), performed by the computer for producing (creates, line 57 column 4) an output object (a relevant reply message, line 57 column 4) by using a result produced by the executed input function (once the request has been executed, line 56 column 4).

As to claim 15, Dean as modified further teaches the received input object is received from an application (front end booking software, line 29 column 2), computer

programs (lines 60 column 3 to line 32 column 5) performed by the computer for returning (sends, line 64 column 4) the output object (the message, line 64 column 4) to the application.

As to claim 16, Dean as modified further teaches the received input object is received from a user (a client, line 28 column 2), computer programs (lines 60 column 3 to line 32 column 5) performed by the computer for returning the output object (12 and 13, Fig. 3) to the user.

As to claim 17, Dean as modified further teaches receiving (handles, line 11 column 2) a plurality of input objects (requests, line 11 column 2), wherein each received input object contains an input function (request data, line 50 column 2), and wherein each input function has a predefined signature (ticket booking, line 28 column 2).

As to claim 18, Dean as modified further teaches computer programs (lines 60 column 3 to line 32 column 5) performed by to a computer for regulating a flow (5 and 6, Fig. 3, and lines 14-29 column 4) of received input objects.

As to the method of claim 1, note the discussion of the apparatus of claim 11 above.

As to claims 2-8, note the discussions of claims 12-18 above, respectively.

As to the computer program of claim 21, note the discussion of the apparatus of claim 11 above.

As to claims 22-28, note the discussions of claims 12-18 above, respectively.

5. Claims 9, 19 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dean in view of Smithies, and further in view of Aditham U.S Patent No. 6,378,001.

As to claim 19, Dean as modified does not disclose a queue. Aditham teaches storing received objects in a queue (FIFO queue stores message objects, lines 19-20 column 6). it is necessary to store the objects in an ordered structure while waiting to be processed.

As to claims 9 and 29, note the discussion of claim 19 above.

6. Claims 10, 20 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dean in view of Smithies, and further in view of Nakai U.S Patent No. 6,253,248.

As to claim 20, note the discussions of claims 15 and 16 above. However, Dean as modified does not disclose a request to resend an object. Nakai teaches requesting the sender (requests the client 107, line 40 column 13) to re-send the received input objects (to resend the request, line 41 column 13) at a later time (1213, Fig. 14). It would have been obvious to apply the teachings of Nakai to the system of Dean because if the client's application needs to be updated, the client has to resend the quest to the server.

As to claims 10 and 30, note the discussion of claim 20 above.

Conclusion

Please refer to the references listed on the attached PTO-892, which are not relied upon in the claim rejections detailed above.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to The T. Ho whose telephone number is 703-306-5540. A voice mail service is also available for this number. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Thursday, 8:30 am – 6:00 pm, and every other Friday from 8:30 am – 5:00 pm.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C 20231

Or fax to:

- AFTER-FINAL faxes must be signed and sent to (703) 746 – 7238
- OFFICAL faxes must be signed and sent to (703) 746 – 7239
- NON OFFICAL faxes should not be signed, please send to (703) 746 – 7240



ST. JOHN COURTEMAY III
PRIMARY EXAMINER

t.h
August 9, 2002